

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of August 1, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-26, and 30-33 remain in this application.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 15, 18, 21, 25, are amended.

Claims 6, 22, and 27-29 have been canceled.

The Office Action

The claims are objected to for informalities under 37 CFR 1.75(g).

In view of claim amendments, Applicant submits that no reordering of the claims is required.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Claim 9 has been amended to recite a recess for storing tools. Withdrawal of the §112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 10-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0134013 to Slone in view of US 6,484,348 to Paterson, et al.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0134013 to Slone in view of US 6,484,348 to Paterson, et al., and further in view of DE2943527 to Rodekuhr.

Claims 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0134013 to Slone in view of US 6,484,348 to Paterson, et al., and further in view of US 5,561,885 to Zahuranec.

Claims 25-28, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0134013 to Slone in view of US 2003/0028994 to Kitimaura.

Claims 5-7, 21, 22, 29, 32, and 33 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but are considered to be allowable.

For the reasons outlined below, it is submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 6, which was considered to contain allowable subject matter, has been incorporated into claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-4 and 7-14 dependent therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

In particular, none of the cited references: Slone, Patterson, or Rodekuhr, cited against any of these claims, discloses or suggests a vacuum system in which a casing selectively mountable to a receptacle and wherein the casing comprises a panel with a hand hold for selectively withdrawing the casing from the cavity.

Claim 5, which was considered to contain allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 5 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 has been amended to recite a vacuum system for a vehicle comprising a console mounted to the vehicle. The console defines a cavity and a front wall. A casing forms a drawer of the console and is selectively received in the cavity such that an exterior wall of the casing is generally flush with a panel wall of the console.

Support for the amendments to claim 15 are to be found in the specification at paragraph [00024].

The references of record do not suggest such a vacuum system. Slone discloses a portable vacuum unit 90 which is received on a console 24 under a lid 26 of the console. The lid 26 must be lifted to remove the vacuum from a snap fit, socket, or holster mount. There is no suggestion of the vacuum unit 90 having a front wall and forming a drawer of the console 24 such that the vacuum unit can be selectively received in a cavity with the front wall generally flush with a front wall of the console. Paterson does not supply the deficiencies of the primary reference. Paterson discloses a hand held vacuum device but makes no suggestion that it be used as a drawer of a console of a vehicle.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 15 distinguishes patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 18 has been amended to incorporate subject matter of original claim 22, which was considered to be allowable. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 18, and claims 19-21 and 23-24 dependent therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

In particular, none of the cited references: Slone, Patterson, or Zahuranec, cited against any of these claims, discloses or suggests a vacuum cleaner comprising a receptacle mounted to a motor vehicle and a casing comprising a dirt container, a suction source, and a filter positioned upstream from the suction source, with a cyclonic airflow chamber being defined in the dirt container upstream of the filter.

Claim 25 has been amended to incorporate subject matter of allowed claim 29, as well as claims 27 and 28. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 25, and claims 26 and 30-33 dependent therefrom, are now in condition for allowance.

In particular, neither Sloane nor Kitimaura discloses or suggests a vacuum cleaner for a vehicle which includes a casing selectively mounted to the vehicle chassis including a dirt container, a cyclonic airflow chamber, and a filter extending into the dirt container, the cyclonic airflow chamber being at least partially defined between the filter and an interior surface of the dirt container.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-26, and 30-33) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call the undersigned, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

1 Nov 2005

Date



Jay F. Moldovanyi

Reg. No. 29,678

1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582